



---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**0457/32**

Paper 3 Written Paper

**March 2017**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the March 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1(a)	Candidates should identify the trend and the main reason from Source 1.  (i) <b>increase</b> in extended/multigenerational/large families; or similar (ii) due to unemployment  1 mark for each correct answer, up to a maximum of 2 marks	<b>2</b>	<b>Further Guidance</b>  (a) The only acceptable answers are located in Source 1. Candidates may use their own words.

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
1(b)	<p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of privacy</li> <li>• higher costs</li> <li>• risk of conflict</li> <li>• lack of space</li> <li>• elderly people may need care</li> </ul> <p>Candidates are likely to give the following reasons to justify their choice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible further consequences or effects</li> <li>• Degree of impact/seriousness for individuals/groups</li> <li>• How many people/groups are affected</li> <li>• Increasing cycle of decline</li> <li>• How widespread the problem is</li> <li>• How easy to solve</li> <li>• Effects on natural world and human ways of life</li> <li>• Other reasonable response</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 4 (4 marks) Strong response</b> Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation; may compare different disadvantages; usually two (or more) developed arguments clearly linked to the issue; or a range of undeveloped reasons.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Reasonable response</b> Some reasoned explanation of why one disadvantage is the most significant; usually one (or more) developed argument(s) suggested with some link to the issue, but may be implicit at times; or several undeveloped reasons.</p>	4	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>(a) Only one of the disadvantages needs to be identified from the source.</p> <p>(b) Candidates are likely to discuss one of the disadvantages from Source 2 as listed; however, the assessment is focussed upon their reasoning/justification and therefore alternative disadvantages should be credited.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Basic response</b> Identifies a disadvantage as important but argument is weak or not linked to the issue explicitly.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response</b> Simple identification of a disadvantage but no attempt to justify or the reasoning is not related to the issue.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>		
1(c)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates are likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in Sources 1 and 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The advantages/benefits of extended families for the individual</li> <li>• The disadvantages of not living with the family</li> <li>• The benefits of extended families for human welfare – food, care, ease of access, etc.</li> <li>• Issues of value and beliefs about the responsibility of families</li> <li>• Differences in benefit/reasons by age, gender and employment status</li> <li>• Other reasonable responses</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong response</b> Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation; usually two (or more) developed arguments clearly linked to the issue; or a wide range of undeveloped reasons.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response</b> Some reasoned explanation; usually one (or more) developed argument(s) with some link to the issue, but may be implicit at times; or several undeveloped reasons. Lower in the band arguments may begin to lack clarity, and/or be partial and generalised. A tendency to assert may be apparent.</p>	<b>6</b>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic response</b> Basic reasoning and explanation; the response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted explanation, with only undeveloped point. Arguments are partial, generalised and lack clarity.</p> <p>Lower in the band the arguments are likely to be very generalised, lack relevance to the issue and/or simply recycle/copy material from the Sources without any explanation or development.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant or creditworthy material.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
2(a)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p><b>Possible Types of Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• compare statistics/information</li> <li>• interview or questionnaire data</li> <li>• expert testimony</li> <li>• case studies</li> <li>• other relevant response</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible Sources of Information</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• national and local governments and their departments</li> <li>• international organizations e.g. United Nations; UNESCO</li> <li>• experts</li> <li>• research reports</li> <li>• pressure groups, charities and non government organisations</li> <li>• media and worldwide web</li> <li>• other relevant response</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible Methods</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents</li> <li>• interviews</li> <li>• interview relevant experts</li> <li>• internet search</li> <li>• questionnaires</li> <li>• surveys</li> <li>• other relevant response</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong Response</b> Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of a range of ways to test the claim. The response contains two (or more) developed points, and may contain some undeveloped points. The response is clearly and explicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable Response</b> Reasoned and mainly credible explanation of ways to test the claim. The response contains one (or more) developed point(s), and may contain some undeveloped points.  The response is explicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic Response</b> Basic explanation of ways to test the claim. The response contains one or two simple, undeveloped and asserted points.  There is little relevance in the response to testing the claim or the methods, sources and types of information are generally not appropriate for the claim being tested.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant or creditworthy material</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
2(b)	<p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People you would need to persuade; businesses, parents, young people, local council, etc.</li> <li>• These people have the power to do something about the situation.</li> <li>• Reasons for the need</li> <li>• Advertising, interviews, posters, etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong Response</b> Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of how you could persuade people. The response is likely to have developed a response for two (or more) points, and some undeveloped points. The response is clearly and explicitly related to the issue.</p> <p>Lower in the band a greater proportion of the points will be left undeveloped.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable Response</b> Some supported reasoning and explanation. The response is likely to have a developed response for one (or more) point(s), and some undeveloped points. The relevance to the issue is apparent but may be implicit at times.</p> <p>Lower in the band points may begin to lack clarity, and/or be partial and generalised.</p>	<b>6</b>	



Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic Response</b> Basic reasoning and explanation. The response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted suggestions, with only one (or more) undeveloped point(s). Explanations are partial and lack clarity. There is little relevance to the issue.</p> <p>Lower in the band the points are likely to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and/or simply recycle/copy material from the Source material without any explanation or development.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant or creditworthy material</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
3(a)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>A value judgement is a view or belief about what is important or ethical/moral.</p> <p>The following are value judgements given in Nathalia’s letter to Meena:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “I would have to share with my sister. This isn’t fair is it?”</li> <li>• “It seems only right that she should now benefit in some way”</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response</b> The response demonstrates clear understanding of value judgements and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the Source.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response</b> The response demonstrates some understanding of value judgements and attempts to apply this to a correct example identified from the Source. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response</b> The candidate identifies a value judgement from the source correctly but does not explain the nature of the part; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>a) If the example is incorrect the candidate must score 0 even if the reasoning suggests some understanding of the nature of value judgements.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
3(b)	<p>Indicative Content</p> <p>It's both as it's what Meena thinks/it's her opinion, and it's a fact as mum is worried about her.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response</b> The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of this part of an argument.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response</b> The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of this part of an argument. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response</b> The candidate identifies the part of the argument but does not explain the nature of the part; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	3	

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
3(c)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates are expected to evaluate the reasoning in the response. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about how good the reasoning is.</p> <p>Candidates may consider the following types of issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• quality of the argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– clarity</li> <li>– tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise</li> <li>– language</li> <li>– balance</li> </ul> </li> <li>• quality of the evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– relevance</li> <li>– sufficiency – sample</li> <li>– source – media; radio</li> <li>– date – how recent</li> <li>– factual, opinion, value, anecdote</li> <li>– testimony – from experience and expert</li> </ul> </li> <li>• knowledge claims</li> <li>• ability to see</li> <li>• sources of bias <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– gender</li> <li>– political</li> <li>– personal values</li> <li>– experience</li> </ul> </li> <li>• likelihood of solutions working and consequences of their ideas</li> <li>• acceptability of their values to others <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	12	

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 5 (11–12 marks) Very good response</b> Clear, credible and well supported points about how well Meena responds to Nathalia’s letter. Coherent, structured evaluation of the response with clear reference to both letters.</p> <p>The response contains three (or more) developed evaluative points, and may include some undeveloped points.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (8–10 marks) Strong response</b> Clear, supported points about how well Meena responds to Nathalia’s letter. Evaluation of the response, with reference to both letters.</p> <p>The response contains two (or more) developed evaluative points and may include some undeveloped points. A wide range (four or more) of undeveloped but clearly appropriate points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–7 marks) Reasonable response</b> Reasonable points about how well Meena responds to Nathalia’s letter. Some evaluation of the response, with an attempt use both letters. Judgements and evaluative points are partially supported or asserted.</p> <p>One (or more) developed evaluative points, possibly with some undeveloped points; three (or more) undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Basic response</b> Basic points about how well Meena responds to Nathalia’s letter. There may be reference to only Meena’s response, with little attempt to consider Nathalia’s letter. Judgements and evaluative points are partially supported and lack clarity/relevance at times.</p> <p>The response contains two (or more) undeveloped points.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response</b> Limited and unsupported points about how well Meena responds to Nathalia’s letter. The response considers the arguments briefly and/or tangentially. There is little clarity. Answers at this level may repeat source material with little understanding or simply agree/disagree with the arguments presented.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant or creditworthy material</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
4	<p><b>Target Assessment Objective:</b> evaluate sources, claims and the effectiveness of arguments; develop a line of reasoning to support a judgement.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates are expected to argue using reasons and evidence to justify their opinion and judgement about the issue i.e. where responsibility should lie for caring for the elderly.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use and develop the material found in the sources, but should go beyond simply repeating or recycling without adaptation. Other material may be introduced but it is not necessary to gain full marks.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to consider the following arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reference to scale of impact on individual/group/governmental behaviour/actions</li> <li>• how long it takes to make a difference</li> <li>• the effects of cultural differences and beliefs</li> <li>• barriers to change</li> <li>• the power of collective action</li> <li>• the difficulties of changing individual behaviour</li> <li>• the influence of individuals and groups acting locally</li> <li>• the role of vested interests and power differences</li> <li>• potential conflict</li> <li>• difficulties in coordinating globally and across different countries with independence</li> <li>• cost and access to resources to implement change</li> <li>• governmental responses and action</li> <li>• other reasonable response</li> </ul>	18	

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 5 (16–18 marks) Very good response</b> Clear, well supported reasoning about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are clearly considered.</p> <p>The response contains a wide range of clearly reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with three (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points.</p> <p>A clear judgement is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (12–15 marks) Strong response</b> Clear, supported reasoning about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are considered.</p> <p>The response contains a range of reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with two (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points.</p> <p>A judgement is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (8–11 marks) Reasonable response</b> Some supported reasoning about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are included.</p> <p>The response contains some points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with one (or more) developed point(s), and some undeveloped points.</p> <p>An attempt is made to give an overall judgement.</p>		



Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 2 (4–7 marks) Basic response</b> Basic reasoning about the issue. Different arguments are included; perspectives, if present, are unclear.</p> <p>The response relies on assertion rather than evidence but contains some undeveloped points.</p> <p>A basic judgement may be attempted.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks) Limited response</b> Limited and unsupported reasoning about the topic in general. Different arguments may be included.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant or creditworthy material</p>		